

Application No. 10/797,960
Amendment dated January 23, 2006
After Final Office Action of November 23, 2005

Docket No.: 65856-0056

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Advisory Action dated February 3, 2006, and the Office Action mailed November 23, 2005. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a teleconference on February 16, 2006; for the allowance of claims 22-33, 50 and 51; and for indicating that claims 6, 11-19 and 36-44 would be patentable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 11 and 14, and independent claim 34 incorporates the limitations of dependent claim 37, as limited in Applicants' earlier response of October 10, 2005. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 34 are allowable, as indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action of November 23, 2005.

In response to the Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 12, 13, 15-19, 34 and 38-40 and canceled claims 11, 14 and 37. Accordingly, claims 22-33, 50 and 51 are allowed, and claims 1-13, 15-21, 34-36, 38-49, 52, and 53 remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the present application in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 was objected to due to the recitation of "the diaphragm spring" without a proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, claim 6 has been amended to depend from claim 5 to provide proper antecedent basis for 'the diaphragm spring.'

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112

Claims 1-7, 9-21, 49, 52, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants note that independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that "the return spring selectively has a generally disc-shaped configuration" as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102 and §103

Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10, 34, 35, 47, 49, 52, and 53, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wright, U.S. Pat. No. 1,714,748.

Application No. 10/797,960
Amendment dated January 23, 2006
After Final Office Action of November 23, 2005

Docket No.: 65856-0056

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright ('748).

Claims 20, 45, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright ('748) in view of Nakane ('862).

Claims 21 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright ('748) in view of Gochenour et al. US 2003/0042108 A1).

The above rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the amendments presented herein. As indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action of November 23, 2005, and in the teleconference of February 16, 2006, all pending claims in the present application are allowable.

CONCLUSION


In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. If, however, there are any outstanding issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is earnestly encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 65856-0056 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By


Michael B. Stewart

Reg. No. 36,018

Kenneth W. Jarrell

Registration No.: 52,484

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

39533 Woodward Avenue

Suite 140

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304

(248) 593-3310

Attorneys for Applicant

R0339151.DOC